

**White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation
Day 2 Breakout Session Compilation**

Topic: Improving Certainty and Incentives for Stakeholders

Session number: 38

Facilitator: Gregory Bourne

Morning

Location: 260

A. Major Repeated Themes Raised in the Discussion. *A grouping of ideas repeated with some frequency in the session and brought up again during the group summation process. Also includes diverging views and/or questions about the topic.*

- Need for Market Based Incentives
- Balance Tension of regulation (too much vs. too little) How do we “Incentives”
- Protection of Species?
- How do we enable local leadership?
- Need to improve cooperation between agencies
- Incentives for information sharing.
- Ties between uplands and oceans.
- Need incentives to get past “Fear Factor and facts on outcomes
- Need a holistic approach and not improve one resource at the expense of another.
- Need to ensure enforcement mechanisms are still in place
- Need strong leadership now and in the future to improve certainty.
- Incentives for increasing species recovery projects

B. National-level Practical Actions *that could be taken by the Federal government, national NGO’s, and other national organizations. Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.*

- Develop common protocols regulations
 - Remove barriers to Federal Partnerships so they can participate fully in collaborative efforts
 - Federal Land management agencies spend money on non-federal lands to accomplish multiply objectives.
 - Develop offshore incentives to offset detrimental marine effects
 - Make delisting work as well as listing (ESA)
 - Setting National priorities implement locally
 - Violent agreement on the need for one jurisdiction on ESA.
 - Develop a national framework for watersheds to the oceans.
 - Balance between small and large land ownerships
 - Using Farm/Ranch Saving accounts
 - Tax credits for land/species conservation
-
- Need to seek continuity of vision given diverse communities of places and interests

This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.

- Easier to raise money in populated areas this is not always were the greatest need for action.
- Not always dealing with long term landowners- sometimes they are corporate giants, where profit margins are the most important.
- Funding Sources can be in conflict (soybean subsidies and protecting prairies)
- One size does not fit all
- Ocean issues are coming
- National Priorities locally-driven
- Variation in Private/ Public
- National Interests vs Local

C. **Local-level Practical Actions** *that could be taken at the local or community level by Tribes, state and local communities, private citizens, and local organizations. Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.*

- Local partners must develop common vision at the outset
- Clearly identify and engage constituents
- Improve accountability, integrating all major interests
- Federal/State/Local interagency cooperation
- One-stop shop for information
- Develop cost-share arrangements
- Establish wetland mitigation banks
- Utilize conservation easements and link to long term investments such as IRA
- Simplify outcomes
- Pool resources to community
- Share working models within the same landscape (knowledge, labor and equipment)
- Build on the Gulf Coastal Plan Ecosystem Partnership concept
- Identify locally driven values for endangered species, allows community to recognize value of species then assign a dollar value to the species.
- Interagency cooperation and coordination, building on Utah Partners in Conservation
- Improving communications to the general public will improve engagement

D. **Particularly insightful quotes from participants** that capture the essence of key points made during the group's discussion. "I got into this for self-protection, but maybe this collaboration is a better way to meet my needs"; "In 25 years I've never met a landowner who woke up in the morning and said I really want to wreck this place. They should not be fearful of regulation.;" "I'm a lawyer, I can tie almost anything in knots. I believe the notion of cooperative conservation is to agree on the objective and then find a common sense way to get there."

**White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation
Day 2 Breakout Session Compilation**

This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.

Topic: Improving Certainty and Incentives for Stakeholders

Session number: 38

Facilitator: Frank Dukes

Morning

Location: 261

A. Major Repeated Themes Raised in the Discussion

- Agencies need to work together instead of against each other or protect turf.
- Trust provides & improves certainty. Need to find ways to create trust and facilitate dialogue earlier on. Groups that are trusted by many of the stakeholders.
- Voluntary conservation management practices work better because they're voluntary, driven by all parties and are integrated versus individual agency best management practices.
- Administration needs to continue emphasis on CC as a priority by administration leaders providing visible support, rewarding agencies that work together, continuing funding and bundling various incentives and certainty between agencies.
- Landowners care about their land (heritage) and hence are concerned about both conservation (being a good steward) & about its productivity (profit). The combination of these two improves incentives
- Effects at a broad scale need to be achieved with national or regional stated imperatives (goals).
- There are various ways to use Third parties to achieve CC (501(3)c's., Co-ops & task forces)
- Keep working landscapes working to achieve CC. Raise visibility and messages to public about how working landscapes achieve CC. (use examples).
- Uncertainty (e.g. changing regulations affecting what is "legal") keep landowners from stepping forward .
- Need to find ways to create trust and facilitate dialogue earlier on. Groups that are trusted by many of the stakeholders.
- Fragmentation of open space is a major concern.

B. National-level Practical Actions

- Expand regulatory certainty for landowners and companies to go beyond compliance and reduce risk of future regulation. E.G. Safe Harbors, Brownfields, Mitigation Bankers.
- Utilize policies & laws that reinforce early involvement by participants, e.g. organizations that come in at the end of a process to disrupt.
- Keep stewards on the land. Make it worth their while through easements, payments for services, etc.
- Remove obstacles to using multiple programs under the Farm Bill and get rid of conflicting requirements. If landowner is part of collaborative or landscape ecosystem plan, allow more flexibility to use multiple programs

This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.

and remove income caps that are a disincentive to large landowner participation

- Support suburban community forestry open space programs (S. 941).
- Support President's capital gains proposal.
- Expand markets for what you want & expand markets for ecosystem services.
- Federal govt. can set goals, but private sector should help design market based incentives. Then govt supports and monitors achievement.
- Expand use of third parties to achieve CC, e.g. broker mitigations and environmental services, disperse funding more efficiently by receiving funds from multiple sources and dispersing to individual farmers, facilitate landowner co-ops to develop their own conservation management practices, aggregate ecosystem service benefits across multiple landowners, get agencies working together to resolve differences and conflicts between regulations and regulators, contract with third parties to do remediation and negotiation..
- Use fines to improve CC on the ground, instead of returning funds to the Treasury, e.g. supplemental environmental programs., BUT avoid the reverse incentive (i.e. speeding ticket quotas).
- Support DOD encroachment initiative.
- Develop & expand pilots for Co-ops under the Farm Bill. They can distribute funds to farmers more efficiently, especially when Co-ops tailor & develop conservation practices.

C. Local-level Practical Actions

- Conservation constituents go to Congress with good news to support programs that are working.
- NGOs develop web based networks so landowners can connect & get service providers.
- Private sector should help design market based incentives.
- Support organizations that all parties trust. They are key to dialogue & getting people and agencies to work together.
- Rural communities should engage mayors of cities about what incentives will work to avoid open space fragmentation. Also include perspectives of land developers. This will broaden our perspective on fragmentation incentives & help develop creative solutions.

D. Particularly insightful quotes from participants

- "Too often we offer incentives as a hook with a hammer at the end. The incentive goes away but the hammer (or regulation) remains."
- "US farmers have grown the best food in the world. If you want us to grow ducks, tell us you want us to grow ducks and help us make it profitable."

**White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation
Day 2 Breakout Session Compilation**

This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.

Topic: Improving Certainty and Incentives for Stakeholders

Session number: 38

Facilitator: Catherine Barner

Morning

Location: 262

- A. Major Repeated Themes Raised in the Discussion.** *A grouping of ideas repeated with some frequency in the session and brought up again during the group summation process. Also includes diverging views and/or questions about the topic.*

INVEST IN PEOPLE—Training/attitudes

--incentives & rewards

--communication/education/economics

LEVELS OF GOVT—Coordination/alignment/up and down/integration

REGULATIONS—simplification/ledgibility/flexible/no “one size fits all”/ safe harbor from litigation

How do you create incentives for change?

Tensions created between conflicting goals—urban sprawl vs. the benefits of progress.

Looking to value added for complying with regulatory process.

Local administration works better than federal control.

Various govt. levels and interagency ability to coordinate in decision making process.

Private land use needs incentives for investment and protection from litigation.

Reward rather than penalize.

Simplifying the regulatory process and language.

Govt does not always have the dollars—teamwork and leveraging

Policy of Feds needs to align with local

Personal attitude adds to success.

Integrate local knowledge with science and economics to apply to local landscapes.

Ability to be flexible and make decisions on local level.

Defining “Success” to each group at the outset.

Conflict vs collaboration mentality

- B. National-level Practical Actions** *that could be taken by the Federal government, national NGO’s, and other national organizations. Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.*

Education, training, flexibility of Govt EEs

Outcome vs. rule based programs.

Be willing to consider that one size does not fit all in the regulatory environment—what works in coastal Mississippi may fail in the Rockies.

Look outside our borders when looking to projects, policies or incentives.

Incentives at federal level for state/local education to influence attitudes in environmental protection.

Simplify regulations—more legible & flexible

Funding

This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.

Remove liability
Harmonization
Understand local landscapes
Integrate functions between local and Federal (particularly middle management)
Training—guidance on how to be a good partner—reward
Reconcile economic/social disconnect (ie WV has rich forests and yet state has extensive poverty)
Outcome based programs & regulations—science, social science, economic & role of scale (local vs territorial)
Cost Sharing
National network of education
System to provide closure
Empower local Federal staff—reward for flexibility
Integrate planning/education/communication/best practices
Funding for forest lands

C. Local-level Practical Actions *that could be taken at the local or community level by Tribes, state and local communities, private citizens, and local organizations. Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.*

Pilots easier to get off the ground then easier to sell to others and easier to see immediate results.
Local officials are easier to hold accountable.
Locally important issues increase participation and instills the ethic of valuing the results.
Mentality of how each component of the environment interrelates
Incentives may be locally driven.

Local Action: Education/technical assistance/funding/safe harbor/take local considerations into consideration/honor local vision/use ombudsmen/form effective local teams/common ground for local development and conservation to coexist/clear goals and objectives of partnership (both local and Federal)/remove liability for land owners who do the right thing

D. Particularly insightful quotes from participants that capture the essence of key points made during the group's discussion.

Those pesky locals need to be part of the discussion.
We're all in this together.
Reward the new order.
Anytime everyone is willing to cooperate, you can resolve anything.

This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.

**White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation
Day 2 Breakout Session Compilation**

Topic: Improving Certainty and Incentives for Stakeholders

Session number: 38

Facilitator: Randy Moore

Morning

Location: 263

A. Major Repeated Themes Raised in the Discussion. *A grouping of ideas repeated with some frequency in the session and brought up again during the group summation process. Also includes diverging views and/or questions about the topic.*

- Look at things from a big picture and shared vision
 - Longer timelines
 - More reality and honesty in shared vision
 - Watershed perspectives
- Need adaptive management
 - There because we want government to be flexible
 - Successful at the site level- Ex. Walla Walla watershed
- Recognize site or regional specific needs
- Patience, honesty, reality
- Certainty critical to keep people at table.
- Have clear authorities – roles and responsibilities identified
- Minimize risk to keep people at the table
 - Particularly with institutions- politics, regulations
- Treat all partners as equals (a basic ground rule)
 - Say it because it antithetical to the normal
- Be results focused
- Be clear with regulations and regulatory standards and all must understand and follow rules- the regulated and the administration
 - Hold decision-makers accountable
- Unintended consequences need to be considered and identified upfront (alternative view was that unintended consequences are not unintended b/c someone in policy wanted those outcomes- want to regulate what people are doing- Ex. SCS to NRCS)
- Changes of administration forces the collaborative process to start all over again.

B. National-level Practical Actions *that could be taken by the Federal government, national NGO's, and other national organizations. Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.*

- Treat all partners as equals
- Have incentives to bring people to the table
- Need a culture change within agencies from the top down
- Too many people don't have experience working in sectors they're regulating, so encourage employee exchanges between local groups, private sector to see things from others perspectives

This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.

- i. Rancher following agency around for 10 days and vice versa
- Minimize risk of participation (ex. Agency coming back and changing things at end of process)
- Have maximum flexibility and minimum risk
- One-stop shopping; removing of silos (NGOs, Feds, etc.)
 - i. How? Network of governance- Fed and non-fed all at table
 - ii. Can't function well with too many involved; have to deal with issues of your own first

C. Local-level Practical Actions *that could be taken at the local or community level by Tribes, state and local communities, private citizens, and local organizations. Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.*

- One-stop shopping; removing of silos (NGOs, Feds, etc.)
 - How? Network of governance- Fed and non-fed all at table
 - Can't function well with too many involved; have to deal with issues of your own first
- Can there be one entity to call the shots with all agencies involved?
 - Have to come to an agreement on that
- Ex. Habitat Conservation Plans; Ex. Natural Heritage Areas with NPS- they're an equal player not a driver

D. Particularly insightful quotes from participants *that capture the essence of key points made during the group's discussion.*

- There's a tension between the desire for flexibility and the need for rules.
- They took the white hat off and put the black hat on. (Moving from local, technical assistance to a regulatory approach.)
- It's going to take a generation or more to establish that trust again.
- Recognize that collaboration should not be the same as policy and politics as historically practiced.
- 15 or 20 years ago, the focus was on consensus and today it's on solving problems.
- Coming to agreement to solve the problem often takes longer and more resources than consensus building.
- Consensus is easy, solving the problems is difficult.
- A vision without action is a daydream, and action without vision is a nightmare. (From Mayor Anthony Williams)
- Good governance means good stewardship.
- The private sector deals with the good stuff, the government deals with the bad stuff, and the NGOs deal with what even the government doesn't deal with.

This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.